

**Remarks**

The Office Action mailed August 30, 2004 and the Advisory Action dated October 12, 2004 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 15-18, 20, 32, 33, 37, 39, 42 and 43 are now pending in this application. Claims 15 and 37 have been amended, and claims 19, 29-31, 34-46, 38, 40 and 41 have been cancelled. Claim 43 is newly added.

Applicants previous Amendment After Final Office Action was refused entry on the ground that claim 43 raised a new issue. Claim 43 has been strictly rewritten into independent form as suggested in the Advisory Action, and in all other aspect the amendments to the claims are unchanged from the previous Amendment After Final Office Action. As all outstanding claims rejections have been overcome, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

Claims 19, 34-36, 40, and 41 were withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention and are accordingly cancelled without prejudice in this amendment.

Claims 29, 31 and 38 are cancelled but the recitations of claims 29, 31 and 38 now appear in claims 15, 42, and 37, respectively. In light of the indicated allowability of these claims in the Final Office Action, Applicants submit that the pending claims define allowable subject matter as set forth below.

The rejection of Claims 15-18, 20, 30-33, 37, 39, and 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mollet (U.S. Patent No. 5,280,261) in view of Baird et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,601,737) or in view of Rybka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,160,471) is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 now includes the recitations of former dependent claim 29, now cancelled, which was indicated in the Final Office Action as reciting allowable subject matter. Claim 15 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Mollet in view of Baird et al. or in view of Rybka et al.

Claim 30 and 31 is cancelled.

Claims 16-18, 20, and 32-33, depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 15. When the recitations of Claims 16-18, 20, and 32-33 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 15, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 6-18, 20, and 32-33 likewise are patentable over Mollet in view of Baird et al. or in view of Rybka et al.

Claim 37 now includes the recitations of former dependent claim 38, now cancelled, which was indicated in the Office Action as reciting allowable subject matter. Claim 37 is therefore submitted to be patentable over Mollet in view of Baird et al. or in view of Rybka et al.

Claims 39 and 42 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 37. When the recitations of Claims 39 and 42 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 37, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 39 and 42 likewise are patentable over Mollet in view of Baird et al. or in view of Rybka et al.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 15-18, 20, 30-33, 37, 39, and 42 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 29, 31 and 38 is respectfully traversed. Claims 29, 31, and 38 are cancelled. Applicant accordingly request that the objection to Claims 29, 31 and 38 be withdrawn.

Newly added claim 43 may be recognized as former dependent claim 31, now cancelled, strictly rewritten into independent form. The Final Office Action indicated that claim 31 recited allowable subject matter, and claim 43 is accordingly submitted to be patentable over the cited art.

Express Mail Label No.

BUS-025877 DIV2  
PATENT

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Bruce T. Atkins  
Registration No. 43,476  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070